

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 10, 2003 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this case, of which claims 1 and 7 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,259,914 to Koster ("Koster").

The invention as recited in claim 1, whose language has been amended for clarity, is directed to a "method for managing a foreign mobile subscriber in a visitor location register (VLR) . . . comprising the steps of . . . (b) determining whether roaming service is established for a country of the foreign mobile subscriber by checking if a number of a country code received from the foreign mobile subscriber exists in a country code index table of the VLR when the subscriber in step (a) is determined to be a foreign mobile subscriber."

Page 3 of the Office Action cites, in rejection of step (b), col. 5, lines 52-57 of Koster. The cited passage discloses activation and registration of a mobile station (col. 4, lines 32-33) using an enhanced (col. 5, lines 32-34) Home Location Register (HLR) (col. 5, line 62). Koster notifies the HLR (col. 5, lines 61-62), but there is no mention of a VLR in the cited passage. In particular, Koster fails to disclose "checking if a number . . . exists . . . in a country code index table of the VLR" as explicitly required by the language of claim 1.

In the first Office Action on the merits, page 2 states “However the Examiner maintains that the methods implemented by Koster and the methods implemented by the instant invention are, in all other ways, nearly identical.”

As FIG. 1 of the instant specification shows, however, the HLR is not architecturally equivalent to the VLR. Differences between the two registers are discussed in portions of the specification accompanying FIG. 1; on lines 4 to 19 of column 2 of Koster; and are well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) MPEP 2131.

Koster fails to disclose the checking of the VLR specified in claim 1 and fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 recites “updating the country code index table data and the service provider index table data in the VLR, when the operator’s class is an accessible class.”

Page 4 of the Office Action cites col. 4, lines 48-65 of Koster in rejecting the above language of claim 7.

The cited passage mentions an enhanced Home Location Register (col. 4, line

Amendment  
Serial No. 09/664,507

Docket No. 5000-1-145.

58), but nothing about the Visitor Location Register (VLR). In particular, Koster fails to disclose the updating of the VLR specified in claim 7 and fails to anticipate claim 7 for at least this reason.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

All of the other claims depend from one of the base claims and are likewise deemed to be patentable over the applied reference for at least this reason.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in the event of any perceived outstanding issues so that passage of the case to issue can be affected without the need for a further Office Action.

Amendment  
Serial No. 09/664,507

Docket No. 5000-1-145.

In the event that any additional fee is required to continue the prosecution of this Application as requested, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 502-470.

Respectfully submitted,

CHA & REITER

  
By: Steve S. Cha  
Attorney for Applicant


Date: July 8, 2003

Mail all correspondence to:  
Steve S. Cha  
CHA & REITER  
411 Hackensack Ave, 9<sup>th</sup> floor  
Hackensack, NJ 07601  
Phone: (201)518-5518  
Fax: (201)518-5519

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313 on July 8, 2003.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

  
(Signature and Date)